

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated January 6, 2011, claims 23 and 24 were objected to as being of improper dependent form. Claims 1, 3-9, 45, and 55-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luschi et al. (U.S. patent application publication no. 2003/0045288, hereinafter referred to as “Luschi”) in view of Kadaba et al. (U.S. patent no. 7,158,504, hereinafter referred to as “Kadaba”) and claims 41-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadaba in view of Gopalakrishnan et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,836,666, hereinafter referred to as “Gopalakrishnan”). Claims 43 and 57-59 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 11-12, 14-21, 23-34, 36-40, 46-48, 50, and 60-63 were allowed. The objections and rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 11-12, 14-21, 23-34, 36-40, 46-48, 50, and 60-63.

The applicants are canceling claims 29-34, 36-40, 42, 43, 45, and 55-57.

Claims 23 and 24 were objected to as being of improper dependent form, and in particular as depending upon a canceled claim. Claims 23 and 24 have been amended to obviate the objection and, accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-9, 45, and 55-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luschi in view of Kadaba, claims 41-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadaba in view of Gopalakrishnan, and claims 43 and 57-59 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In order to put the application in condition for allowance, the applicants have amended rejected claim 1 to include the features of ‘objected to’ claim 57 and at least portions of intervening claims 55 and 56, amended rejected claim 41 to include the features of ‘objected to’ claim 43 and at least portions of intervening claim

42, and amended ‘objected to’ claim 59 to include the features of corresponding independent claim 1 and a portion of intervening claim 58. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claims 1, 41, and 59 may now be passed to allowance.

As rejected claims 3-9 and 58 depend upon allowable claim 1, the applicants respectfully request that claims 3-9 and 58 also may now be passed to allowance. The applicants note that all remaining rejected and objected to claims, that is, claims 43, 45 and 55-57, have been canceled.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless the applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. As the applicant has overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicant contends that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner’s objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicant respectfully solicits allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Furthermore, please charge any additional fees (including any extension of time fees), if any are due, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 505278.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert T. Love et al.

By: /Steven May/

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750